Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology

Volume 15, 2018

Edited by Eli B. Cohen

Informing Science Press

Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology:
Volume 15, 2018

Editor: Eli B. Cohen, Informing Science Institute

Copyright © 2018 by the Informing Science Institute. All rights reserved.

(CC BY-NC 4.0) Articles in this journal are licensed to you under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. When you copy and redistribute any of these articles in full or in part, you need to provide proper attribution to it to ensure that others can later locate this work (and to ensure that others do not accuse you of plagiarism). You may (and we encourage you to) adapt, remix, transform, and build upon the material for any non-commercial purposes. This license does not permit you to use this material for commercial purposes.

Published by:
Informing Science Press
the publication arm of the
Informing Science Institute
131 Brookhill Court
Santa Rosa, California 95409 USA

Telephone: + 1.707.324-3171

Email: Publisher@InformingScience.org

Website: http://InformingSciencePress.com

ISBN: 978-1-68110-035-7

ISSN: 1547-9684

Printed in the USA

The Journal of
Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology

Volume 15, 2018

Table of Contents

Impact of Mathematics on the Theoretical Computer Science Course Units in the General Degree Program in Computer Science at Sri Lankan State Universities
Thambithurai Sritharan 1-14

Virtual Pathology Learning Resource: A Promising Strategy in Teaching Pathology to Allied Health Science Students
Jyothi Thalluri, Joy Penman 15-33

Changing Paradigms of Technical Skills for Data Engineers
Robert T. Mason 35-42

Predicting Suitable Areas for Growing Cassava Using Remote Sensing and Machine Learning Techniques: A Study in Nakhon-Phanom Thailand
J. Kimani Mbugua, Watanyoo Suksa-ngiam 43-56

Medical Image Security using Quantum Cryptography
Olufunso Dayo Alowolodu, Gabriel Kayode Adelaja, Boniface Kayode Alese, Olufunke Catherine Olayemi 57-67

Increasing Intrinsic Motivation of Programming Students: Towards Fix and Play Educational Games
Selvarajah Mohanarajah 69-77

Place Determinants for the Personalization-Privacy Tradeoff among Students
Maor Weinberger, Dan Bouhnik 79-95

The Role of Informing Systems in Securing Sanity and Wisdom of the Globalizing Society in the Context of Civilization Sustainability in the 21st Century: The Case of Poland
Henryk Krawczyk, Andrew Targowski 97-107

Decision Support Information System for Urban Lighting
Michael Dreyfuss, Yahel Giat 109-124

From Ignorance Map to Informing PKM4E Framework: Personal Knowledge Management for Empowerment
Ulrich Schmitt 125-144

Changes in Public Institutions as a Function of Technology and Its Impact on Society
Josueth Meza 145-156

Authentic Assessment Design in Accounting Courses: A Literature Review
Clara Nkhoma, Mathews Nkhoma, Long Ky Tu 157-190

A Data Science Enhanced Framework for Applied and Computational Math
Kirby McMaster, Samuel Sambasivam, Brian Rague, Stuart Wolthuis 191-206

How to Design Accounting Video Lectures to Recover Lost Time
Thando Loliwe 204-247

An Analytical Investigation of the Characteristics of the Dropout Students in Higher Education
Yehia Mortagy, Seta Boghikian-Whitby, Ibrahim Helou 249-278

Review Process

Except where otherwise noted, all papers were reviewed using a process commonly known as double-blind (that is, with author and affiliation information) by between 6 and 10 external reviewers. The reviewers did not know the identity of the authors nor the authors of the reviewers. Reviewers were matched to papers using a formula to minimize the psychological distance between reviewers' stated expertise and interest and the topics covered in the paper. In cases where this formula did not provide at least 6 reviewers, reviewers were randomly assigned to papers. No reviewer was required to review more than 3 papers.

Reviewers were instructed to mentor the submission's authors by providing feedback on how to improve the submission. They were further required to recommend whether or not the paper should be accepted using a six-point scale (from "reject" to "must accept").

The authors of all papers, whether accepted or not, were provided with the reviewers' feedback as part of our process of mentoring authors. Authors of accepted papers were required to revise their submissions in light of the issues raised in the reviews.

We believe that the papers in this journal represent a great contribution to science.